

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 994

52

IR 001 383

AUTHOR Lane, Rodney P.
TITLE The Role of the State in the Development of Public Library Services. Commissioned Papers Project, Teachers College, No. 4.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Teachers College.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Postsecondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Library Programs.
BUREAU NO 00-4026-B
PUB DATE 74
GRANT OEG-0-70-4039 (725)
NOTE 84p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.75 HC-\$4.20 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Financial Support; Government Role; Library Services; Literature Reviews; *Public Libraries; State Agencies; *State Aid; State Legislation; *State Standards

ABSTRACT

Research was conducted in the literature of librarianship to answer basic questions concerning the state role, legal base, and organizational framework related to the development of public library services. The study began with the assumption that state government bears a major responsibility for providing leadership and fiscal support to insure the adequate development of these services. It was concluded that the states in most instances have not performed adequately in their efforts to sustain and build a pattern of public library services. To improve this situation, the development of a definitive legislative basis for state responsibility, creation of a state library board or commission, and state assumption of greater financial responsibility were suggested. (Author/PF)

ED 098994

44

THE ROLE OF THE STATE
IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF
PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICES

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A Commissioned Paper
under the
Commissioned Papers Project
Teachers College, Columbia University
USOE Grant OEG-0-70-4039 (725)
Project Number 00-4026
Part B

Prepared
by

Rodney P. Lane, Senior Associate
Government Studies and Systems, Inc.
University City Science Center
3401 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Division of Library Programs
U. S. Office of Education
1974

IR001 383

Prefatory Note

This paper focusses directly on basic questions concerning the state role, legal base and organizational framework related to the development of public library services. The objective is to assess, in general terms, the state's performance and, more importantly, its prospective capability for developing adequate public library services state-wide.

While the scope of the questions raised is quite broad, the analysis is limited to what are considered to be the key factors and influences which have affected the bounds, constraints, and administrative posture of state level operations in the public library field. No attempt is made to gauge individual state performance, or to make comparative evaluations of state programs.

States have made varied responses to public library development needs and likely will continue to do so. There can be observed, however, a whole set of origin, growth and functional factors, unique to the public library field, which have affected the development of public library services in all states. It is the analyses and impact of these factors that is the primary focus of this paper.

The paper was prepared by Rodney P. Lane. Sharon M. White served as Research Assistant for the project.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. Background and the Present Status of the Public Library.	1
Introduction and Objective	1
The Present Status of the Public Library	5
General Developmental Issues: An Overview	6
Role Issues.	9
Fiscal Factors and Intergovernmental Financing Issues.	12
II. Basic Features and Characteristics of the State Role and Organizational Framework.	17
Basic Elements in State-Local Governmental Relations	26
The Use of Plural Executive Agencies at the State Level	30
State Structure and General Patterns for Public Library Extension	35
Other Characteristics of State Role and Organizational Framework for Public Library Development	43
1. Organizational relationships of state public library agencies to departments of education.	43
2. Nature of the state library agency authority and responsibility	47
3. State financial assistance programs and state-aid administration.	49
III. State Performance and Prospective Capabilities for Development of State-wide Public Library Services	52
Overall Assessment of State Performance.	57
Underlying Causes and Characteristics of a Weak State Role in Public Library Development	61

Table of Contents
(Cont'd.)

	<u>Page</u>
Summary of Key Factors Impacting on State Role Development	.73
1. State legislative base for library services.	.73
2. Use of state library boards and commissions	.74
3. Placement of the state library agency.	.74
4. Relationships between service providing and administrative library functions	.75
5. Considerations for funding the public library.	.76

List of Tables

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE I : State Agencies Responsible for Public Library Extension	19
TABLE II : Placement of Public Library Extension Agencies in the Structure of State Government: January 1956.	31
TABLE III : State Structure and Control for Public Library Extension, by State: January 1956	33
TABLE IV : Characteristics of State Organization and Administration of Public Libraries . .	44

The Role of the State in the Development of Public Library Services

I. Background and the Present Status of the Public Library

Introduction and Objective

The objective of this paper is to examine and assess the general adequacy of state performance and prospective capability for developing and maintaining a viable pattern of public library services for all citizens.

There is a need to make explicit two basic assumptions on which the stated objective is based: (1) It is assumed that the public library represents a positive and desirable influence on today's society. It follows that the most effective and strategic means for providing leadership and support for the further development of the public library should be sought. (2) While the Federal and local levels of government may have important roles to play in the further development of public libraries, it is assumed in this paper that state government bears a major responsibility for providing leadership and fiscal support to insure the adequate development of public library services. This paper commences with the recognition and acceptance of these basic premises. Some information and data will be presented to explicate and rationalize these assumptions, but no direct effort will be made to validate or justify them.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Two recent studies completed by the Government Studies and Systems were entitled "Basic Issues in the Governmental Financing of Public Libraries⁽¹⁾" (1973). and "Alternatives for Financing the Public Library⁽²⁾" (1974). The first of these two studies was prepared as a part of this commissioned paper series. The second was prepared for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS). As indicated by their titles, the focus of these studies was to explore in depth the funding problems of the public library and to propose a viable funding system appropriate for meeting present and future public library needs. The NCLIS paper ended with an analysis of five alternative approaches for financing the public library services. They can be identified as: (1) status quo, no change from the present system, (2) a retrenchment of the Federal Government financing role, (3) direct Federal funding at a 75 - 90 percent of total cost level, (4) expanded state funding role to the 75 - 90 percent level, and (5) a staged funding Program moving toward a balanced intergovernmental funding system. These alternatives are intended as a strategic, rather than an exhaustive grouping of possible options.

(1) Published in "Hearings Before the Select Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 93rd Congress H.R.J. 734 and 766," November 29, 1973, pp. 24-50

(2) Soon to be Published by NCLIS

In recommending the use of a balanced intergovernmental funding approach, the NCLIS report outlined a number of key features, one of which stressed the importance of a newly defined state role.

"Another feature would be directed toward defining and, to the extent possible, requiring an increased level of state fiscal support for public library services. Clearly, for reasons already discussed in this report, the state is the logical and appropriate agency to assume primary responsibility for the maintenance and progressive development of such services. It has both the mandate and the untapped fiscal resources to do the job. Observers of the LSCA program over the years have pressed for increased utilization of these funds to establish and equip viable state library administrative organizations, and they were on point. Any plan to achieve improved library services accessible to all citizens which does not feature increased state administrative and fiscal support carries with it a great burden of proof." (3)

(3) Alternatives for Financing the Public Library,
National Commission on Libraries and Information
Sciences, p. 115-116 (in publication)

Thus, in the context of this analysis of public library funding system problems, possibilities and prospects, it is clear that the state is viewed as having primary responsibility. The basis for assigning that responsibility to the state involved more than an opportunistic assessment of its fiscal and tax-paying resources. Public libraries in this country, nourished as they were by private philanthropy, developed and grew as an almost wholly local institution. State government entry as an administrative planning and fiscal support agency for public libraries came late and at a relatively slow rate of development. Viewed nationally, the states emergence as a consistently strong, policy making administrative, and fiscal force for public library development is far from complete. The stimulus for state library agency development provided by the Library Services and Construction Act (LSCA) was substantial, but its focus was not primarily on building a strong library administrative agency in each state. As stated earlier, other observers of the library scene who stress the importance of the state role have been critical of this weakness of the LSCA.

This paper will look directly, and in some depth, at the role of the state and the state's library agency or agencies in the development of adequate public library services. The scope of the inquiry will include structure,

organization, legislative base and key intergovernmental factors and relationships which effect library service development and financial support. The purpose in neither a precise state-by-state analysis of similarities and differences, nor a series of individual state evaluations and ratings. Rather, the intent is to discern general patterns of strengths and weaknesses in structure and the administrative and fiscal arrangements through which the states implement their public library development role. It is hoped that this general assessment will suggest guidelines and criteria through which all states can strengthen and upgrade their performance in the development of an adequate program of public library services.

The Present Status of the Public Library.

It is essential that state performance in administering and developing public library services be viewed in the light of some general conception of the overall developmental status of the public library. The following paragraphs are intended as a brief summary of observations, issues, problems and priorities which, collectively, describe that present status. The view projected is both selective and normative. After all, organizational patterns, legal bases, and administrative and fiscal support structures cannot be evaluated in a sterile,

value-free vacuum. Thus, analysis of state performance and future capabilities begins with an assessment of present overall strengths and weaknesses of the public library institution

General Developmental Issues: An Overview

1. In many states, a full variety of fiscal, functional and developmental issues now confront the public library, the resolution of which will determine whether we are likely to witness a resurgence or the slow but sure demise of a unique American institution.
2. The functional uniqueness of the public library as a non-specific cultural institution and information resource, coupled with its history of philanthropic support and development, and its low political profile should be viewed, properly, as both an asset and a liability. These and other related characteristics, particularly the exclusionary developmental pattern of public education, have helped to thwart movement of libraries into the mainstream of either education or general governmental services.
3. Legitimate and serious questions can be raised concerning the effective utilization of public library services and the capabilities of the conventional library to provide effective services to meet a widely vary-

ing and changing pattern of needs. The institutional library can be faulted for response and performance failures. However, from an overall governmental perspective, it must be recognized that lack of effective state mandate, the essential localism of the public library institution, weak supervisory structure, low political visibility and, above all, inadequate and an out of balance fiscal support pattern are the major contributing factors to performance failures. Social, economic and demographic shifts and changes have also served to widen differentially the gap between needs and resources and to produce marked changes in need among governmental jurisdictions.

4. Both for philosophic and pragmatic reasons, there needs to be established closer planning, organizational and functional linkages between public libraries and public school libraries. The need for program planning and closer functional relationships are quite obvious. The services and resources provided by school and public libraries should be mutually supportive. From a public policy point of view, the goal is to achieve the maximum effective allocation and utilization of all library resources. The same principle should apply to the coordinated development and use of higher education library resources, many of which receive direct or indirect public support.

5. Clearly, the state level of government has prime responsibility for the development and adequate, consistent fiscal support of public library services in all its subordinate jurisdictions. It has adequate fiscal resources to provide needed increases in public library expenditures over the current low levels in most states. State chief executive officers and legislative leaders must be made more fully aware of the need for a strengthened state mandate and leadership role in developing improved public libraries, and they must provide for a vigorous, aggressive state organization equipped and supported to do the job.
6. There is a legitimate and essential Federal role to insure the progressive development of public library services at the local level, and as a regional and national resource. The Federal role should be implemented through funding programs to encourage and assist sound development patterns, to make possible innovative and responsive library services, and to insure the closing of needs-resources gaps at state and local jurisdictional levels.
7. The Library Services and Construction Act has served useful purposes in the almost two decades of its existence. It has had modest success in activating

state response and state-local funding systems for public libraries. It has suffered, however, from a widening authorization-appropriation gap, an excessive expenditure of funds simply to maintain the status-quo, and an ineffective plan device. More importantly, it does not project the image of full intergovernmental commitment required to establish and maintain progressively improved public library services designed to meet the needs of a modern society.

Role Issues

1. The public library, as it has evolved in the United States, should be viewed as a multi-purpose agency. As Lowell Martin has pointed out, its clientele varies from the most advanced researchers to children engaging in their first reading experience. In institutional form, it should be perceived as both the unique collection of the New York Public Library and the upstairs room of the local village hall. In this context and for the widest variety of clients, all of whom are equally entitled to service, the public library's role is to offer (1) specialized and research services, (2) information services and (3) to perform an informal educational and cultural function.

2. The public library, in one of its guises, plays a strategic role in the interpretation and application of knowledge. It is not pre-eminent in supporting pure research, but nonetheless where libraries have the capacity, they are the resource of the specialist who is, in essence, an adaptor and applier of knowledge. This holds not just for the few libraries of national stature, but for agencies with any depth and scope of holdings dotted in regions across the land. As noted, many public libraries have less than adequate capacity for this role, but it is a function and service required to serve a wide range and variety of citizen-scholars operating as "specialists", who in turn serve the many components of the larger community.
3. The public library is also turned to as a source of specific information rather than organized knowledge. The information requirements vary widely. In information provision, as in support of specialization, the public library does not have a monopoly but shares the function with many sources. It is, however, a basic clearing-house and as such serves a valuable public function. The type of information required may focus on career development, how and where to get a job, consumer advisories and information. The provision of such services is an increasingly vital public function.

4. As advocated by its founders, the public library was viewed as an informal agency for lifelong learning. In past decades, the educational aim has become less distinct and explicit. Currently, however, there is a resurgence of this function in terms of outreach programs for inner-city residents and youth, and it should be extended to suburban and rural areas. There are also new college-level independent study users of the public library. The public library quietly, sometimes too quietly, undergirds many other social, educational and cultural programs, including Head-Start, Model Cities, Community development programs, and others. Too frequently this role is not fully recognized, nor is adequately funded. The extent to which the educational-cultural function of the public library can and should be expanded depends on the quality of life that people will be seeking, and on the extent to which provision for that life is considered to be a public good worthy of adequate financial support.
5. Notwithstanding changes in readership needs and demands, revolutionary advances in media technology and spotty performance patterns, it is inconceivable from a public policy viewpoint that the institution whose

basic responsibility is to "maximize the social utility of the graphic record should be allowed to fade from existence, or to operate at performance levels far below its potential. In a society marked by vast social, economic and cultural cleavages, a less than adequate performance record of public education institutions, and increasing demand for information and new technologies, the public library has a vital role to play. It is a basic business of government, at all levels, to insure the institution's viability and progressive development.

Fiscal Factors and Intergovernmental Financing Issues

1. State and local expenditures for public libraries are extremely small relative to spending for other domestic services and has been growing more slowly than the state-local sector generally.
2. Based on the \$814 million national expenditure noted above, the per capita rate of expenditures in 1971-72 was approximately \$4.00. An exemplary program, such as found in Nassau County, New York, cost just under \$12.00 per capita in the same year. Current calculations for Nassau County indicate a present cost level of almost \$14.00 per capita. It is, of course, impossible to replicate instantly and nationwide the

type of library facilities and service coverage found in Nassau County. But, it is within the realm of the possible to propose a national per capita cost range of \$8.00-\$10.00 as the planning base for an adequate national program of public library services. Total national expenditures might then approximate a range of between \$1.7 billion and \$2.1 billion, based on 1974 population estimates. Start-up and other capital costs required to establish new or expanded facilities are in addition to these figures.

3. It is of fundamental importance to shift a significant portion of the heavy fiscal burden for public library support now placed on local governments. Public library services are essentially local; proximity, access, public and community support must be maintained at the local level. Yet, benefits from library services accrue at the regional, state and national levels and the funding system should more adequately reflect this balance. Large urban centers and other cities saddled with high municipal service costs and facing the greatest need for new, innovative library programs have perhaps the greatest difficulty in financing improved library and other social-cultural services.

4. New or redefined conceptions of Federalism, Revenue Sharing and the continuing impact of Watergate have spurred devolution of a degree of responsibility, authority and political clout to states and local jurisdictions. States and their governors, particularly, are beginning to respond with new and vigorous leadership on a wide front of domestic and consumer oriented programs and policies. The time may be ripe to seek expansion of state responsibility and leadership in the public library area.
5. State governments have been moving toward a more productive and economy-sensitive revenue structure. With few exceptions, states have the fiscal capacity to pick up any slack resulting from curtailment of Federal library aid and, indeed, to increase their participation in library financing.
6. A substantial shift in library financing from the local to the state level (at least 50 percent of the non-Federal cost) would raise the general level of library expenditure and at the same time help eliminate interlocal disparities in the provision of library services.
7. Until its recent curtailment, the Federal Library

Services and Construction Act (LSCA) has been financing about 7 percent of state-local library expenditure for public libraries.

8. The original conception of a program of revenue sharing did not include the wholesale replacement of categorical Federal funding in support of developmental programs with national significance. Even though public libraries are included in the revenue sharing act as a legitimate item for the expenditure of such funds, it is apparent that the amount of additional funds required for the upgrading of public library services will not be provided through general revenue sharing. The form and nature of special revenue sharing or grant consolidation has not yet emerged.
9. Notwithstanding the quite recent new Federal initiative under the so-called Library Partnership Act, there is a need to stress a revitalized Federal functional and fiscal role in an upgraded program of public library support and development. Pressure should be maintained to ensure that the Federal government retains responsibility for a fiscal role designed to further stimulate the states to increase their program leadership and fiscal support responsibilities for expanded local public library services.

At the minimum, the Federal government should provide funds for research and demonstration grants for innovative projects, the expansion of the inter-library cooperation program, and the expansion of data gathering and research functions.

The preceding sections have presented a broad-brush overview of the current situation, perceived problems and developmental trends affecting the current and future status of public libraries. In the light of this overview, the questions this paper seeks to answer are how and in what ways can the state seek to implement its essential role in achieving an appropriately expanded and improved program of public library services available to all citizens. An examination of present patterns in state legal base, organizational administrative and fiscal machinery for public library support and development, next to follow, will provide a base for answering those questions.

II. Basic Features and Characteristics of the State Role and Organizational Framework for Public Library Development

Functionally, public libraries are essentially local institutions which serve as resource centers of information and knowledge accumulated in society's graphic records. Proximity and easy access to these records are prime ingredients to their affective utilization for the benefit of the individual citizen and, through him, for the benefit of the community, region, state and nation. There is an essential interplay, a kind of action-reaction, between the seeker of fact, information and knowledge, and the "keeper" of the record, which reinforces the need for proximity and easy access. Notwithstanding future development and use of the most sophisticated computerized storage systems involving regional state and national library service networks, the requirement of proximity and the action-reaction characteristic of library services likely will remain of paramount importance so that the local base of the library institution also will remain.

Not unrelated to this is the fact that, historically, establishment of local public libraries in urban and suburban centers preceded by many years the development or recognition of a state role as any kind of guarantor of statewide public library services for all citizens.

Alex Ladenson has described the development of state libraries.

"State libraries came into existence early in the nineteenth century. Between 1816 and 1819, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, New Hampshire and New York established libraries primarily for the use of the legislature. Nevertheless, the act creating the State Library of New York declared that its object was to found 'a public library for the use of government and of the people of this State'. By 1840 there were twenty-two state libraries organized, and by 1876 every state and territory in the Union had a library located at its capitol whose collections were predominately in the realm of law." (1)

The point is that, even though state library establishment began early and was completed by 1876, there was no clear responsibility or authority assigned to this agency to extend public library services throughout the state. Further evidence of this point can be seen in Table 1 which lists for each state the date of the law establishing responsibility for public library extension. These data show that in 15 states the enabling legislation

(1) St. Angelo, Hartsfield, Goldstein, State Library Policy, ALA, Chicago, 1971, Appendix F, P.106

Table 1

State Agencies Responsible for Public Library Extension

State	Date When Service Was Established By Law	Agency Responsible:			Change Since Established*		Scope of Responsibility
		At Time of Establishment	In 1925	In 1940	In 1955	Yes	
Alabama	1907	Board of Governors, Department of Archives and History	Board of Governors, Department of Archives and History	Board of Governors, Department of Archives and History	Executive Board, Public Library Service Division, Department of Archives and History	X	E
Arizona	1949	Director, Department of Library and Archives	-----	-----	Director, Department of Library and Archives	X	G, E, L, A, H
Arkansas	1921	State Superintendent of Public Instruction	State Superintendent of Public Instruction	Arkansas Free Library Commission	Arkansas Library Commission	X	G, E
California	1903	Board of Trustees, State Library	State Board of Control, Department of Finance	State Board of Education and State Librarian	State Board of Education and State Librarian	X	G, E, L, LR, H
Colorado	1899	a. Board of Library Commissioners b. Colorado Traveling Library Commission	a. Board of Library Commissioners b. Colorado Traveling Library Commission	State Superintendent of Public Instruction	State Board of Education	X	G, E
Connecticut	1893	Connecticut Public Library Committee ¹	Connecticut Public Library Committee	Connecticut Public Library Committee	State Board of Education	X	E
Delaware	1901	State Library Commission	State Library Commission	State Library Commission	State Library Commission	X	E
Florida	1925	State Library Board	State Library Board	State Library Board	State Library Board	X	G, E, A, H
Georgia	1897	State Library Commission	State Library Commission	State Library Commission	State Board of Education	X	E
Idaho	1901	Free Traveling Library and State Library Commission	State Library Commission ¹	State Library Commission ¹	State Library Board	X	G, E
Illinois	1909	Illinois Library Extension Commission	Secretary of State	Secretary of State	Secretary of State	X	G, E, A
Indiana	1899	Public Library Commission	Library and Historical Board	Library and Historical Board	Library and Historical Board	X	G, E, A, H
Iowa	1900	State Library Commission	State Library Commission	Board of Trustees, State Libraries--Historical and Archives Department	Board of Trustees, State Libraries--Historical and Archives Department	X	G, E, L, LR, A, H

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1
State Agencies Responsible for Public Library Extension (Cont'd)

State	Date When Service Was Established By Law	Agency Responsible:				Charge Since Established		Scope of Responsibility
		At Time of Establishment	In 1925	In 1940	In 1955	Yes	No	
Kansas	1899	Kansas Traveling Libraries Commission, Traveling Library Department of the State Library	Kansas Traveling Libraries Commission, Traveling Library Department of the State Library	Kansas Traveling Libraries Commission, Traveling Library Department of the State Library	Kansas Traveling Libraries Commission, Traveling Library Department of the State Library		X	E
Kentucky	1910	Kentucky Library Commission	Kentucky Library Commission	State Librarian	Director, Library Extension Division	X		E
Louisiana	1920	Louisiana Library Commission	Louisiana Library Commission	Board of Supervisors, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College ²	Board of Commissioners, Louisiana State Library	X		G, E, L, R
Maine	1899	Maine Library Commission	Trustees of the Maine State Library	Trustees of the Maine State Library ³	State Librarian	X		G, E, L, L, R, H
Maryland	1902	State Library Commission	State Board of Education	State Board of Education	State Board of Education	X		E
Massachusetts	1890	Board of Library Commissioners	Massachusetts Board of Free Public Libraries Commission (Division of Department of Education)	Massachusetts Board of Free Public Libraries Commission (Division of Department of Education)	Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners (Division of Department of Education)	X		E
Michigan	1899	State Board of Library Commissioners and State Librarian	State Board of Library Commissioners and State Librarian	State Board for Libraries	State Board for Libraries	X		G, E, L
Minnesota	1899	Minnesota Public Library Commission	State Board of Education	State Board of Education	State Board of Education	X		G, E
Mississippi	1926	Mississippi Library Commission	-----	Mississippi Library Commission	Mississippi Library Commission		X	E
Missouri	1907	Missouri Library Commission	Missouri Library Commission	Missouri Library Commission	State Library Advisory Board and State Librarian	X		GE
Montana	1929	State Library Extension Commission	-----	State Library Extension Commission	State Library Extension Commission		X	E
Nebraska	1901	Nebraska Public Library Commission	Nebraska Public Library Commission ⁴	Nebraska Public Library Commission	Nebraska Public Library Commission		X	E
Nevada	1917	State Library Commission	State Library Commission	State Library Commission	State Librarian	X		G, E, L
New Hampshire	1891	Board of Library Commissioners	Public Library Commission	Public Library Commission	State Library Commission		X	G, E, L, L, R, A
New Jersey	1900	Public Library Commission	Public Library Commission	Public Library Commission	State Board of Education	X		G, E, L, L, R, A, H

Table 1

State Agencies Responsible for Public Library Extension (Cont'd)

State	Date When Service Was Established By Law	At Time of Establishment	Agency Responsible		Change Since Established		Scope of Responsibility
			In 1925	In 1940	In 1955	Yes	No
New Mexico	1929	Board of Regents, State Museum	-----	Board of Regents, State Museum	State Library Commission	X	
New York	1891	Regents of the University	Regents of the University	Regents of the University	Regents of the University		G, E
North Carolina	1909	Library Commission of North Carolina	Library Commission of North Carolina	Library Commission of North Carolina	Board of Trustees, North Carolina State Library (Effective July 1, 1956)	X	G, E, L, LR, A, H G, E
North Dakota	1907	State Library Commission	State Library Commission ⁵	State Library Commission (State Board of Administration)	State Library Commission (State Board of Administration)	X	G, E
Ohio	1896	State Board of Library Commissioners	State Library Board, Department of Education	State Library Board, Department of Education	State Library Board	X	G, E
Oklahoma	1919	Oklahoma Library Commission	Oklahoma Library Commission	Oklahoma Library Commission	Board of Directors, State Library	X	G, E, L, LR, H
Oregon	1905	Oregon Library Commission	Trustees of State Library	Trustees of State Library	Trustees of State Library	X	G, E, LR, A
Pennsylvania	1899	Free Library Commission	State Superintendent of Public Instruction	State Superintendent of Public Instruction	State Superintendent of Public Instruction	X	G, E, L
Rhode Island	1907	State Board of Education	State Board of Education	Secretary of State	Secretary of State	X	G, E, LR, A, H
South Carolina	1929	State Library Board	-----	State Library Board	State Library Board	X	E
South Dakota	1913	Free Library Commission	Free Library Commission	Free Library Commission	State Library Commission	X	G, E, LR
Tennessee	1909	Free Library Commission	Commissioner of Education	Commissioner of Education	State Library and Archives Commission	X	G, E, A, H
Texas	1909	Library and Historical Commission	Library and Historical Commission	Library and Historical Commission	Library and Historical Commission		G, E, LR, A, H
Utah	1909	State Library-Gymnasium Commission	State Board of Education	State Board of Education	State Board of Education	X	E
Vermont	1894	State Board of Library Commissioners	State Board of Education	Free Public Library Commission	Free Public Library Commission	X	E

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1
State Agencies Responsible for Public Library Extension (Cont'd)

State	Date When Service Was Established By Law	Agency Responsible:				Change Since Established		Scope of Responsibility
		At Time of Establishment	In 1925	In 1940	In 1955	Yes	No	
Virginia	1904	The Library Board	The Library Board	The Library Board	The Library Board		X	G, E, A, H
Washington	1901	State Library Commission	State Library Committee	State Superintendent of Public Instruction	State Library Commission	X		G, E, LR
West Virginia	1929	State Library Commission	-----	State Library Commission	State Library Commission		X	E
Wisconsin	1895	State Library Commission	Free Library Commission	Free Library Commission	Free Library Commission		X	G, E, LR
Wyoming	1943	State Librarian ⁶	-----	-----	State Library, Archives and Historical Board	X		G, E, L, LR, A, H
						30	18	

- 1 Under supervision of State board of education.
 2 A general reorganization act of 1940, which transferred the functions of the Louisiana Library Commission to the Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, was declared unconstitutional in 1941.
 3 Under supervision of State department of education; governor and council constituted Trustees of the Maine State Library.
 4 The original commission was abolished in 1933 and the library extension service was placed under the Librarian of the University of Nebraska. Another commission was established in 1935 to take over the service.
 5 Under direction of State board of administration.
 6 State library under supervisor and direction of the supreme court.

Legend
 G - General State Library
 E - Public Library Extension
 L - Law Library
 LR - Legislative Reference
 A - State Archives
 H - State History

* Change in organizational structure since the date of service establishment shown in this column was determined by comparison of agency identification.

Source: The State and Publicly Supported Libraries: Structure and Control at the State Level by Fred F. Beach, et. al., Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1956, pp. 82-85, Scope of responsibility symbols are as indicated in the Basic Data section--pp. 25-77.

was passed in the decade before 1900; in 24 states such action was taken during the period 1900-1920; in seven states the date fell between 1921-1940; and in two states the date of such enactments occurred between 1941 and 1955. Hawaii and Alaska, of course, had not yet become states as of 1955.

Thus, it is clear that two quite separate sets of motivating forces and developmental patterns were operative. The set of forces which led to the creation of local public libraries included a variety of needs for educational, cultural and informational resources felt at the local community level and magnanimity of many philanthropists and local citizens in helping to create an institution which could and did respond to those needs. The literature of the public library field is indeed rich with descriptions of these early efforts and the services provided by the local library. At the state level, the early creation of a state capitol library primarily was a response to the special library resource needs of the legislature, judicial and executive branches of government. As indicated above, jointure of these forces as a beginning point in establishing state governmental policy and organizational machinery for the development of state-wide public library services did not occur in most states until

after 1900. Fiscal support programs came even later, in many cases as a state response to the Library Services Act of 1954 and the later Library Services and Construction Act of 1966.

In tracing this historical growth pattern, Ladenson cites four developmental trends.⁽²⁾ The first is the quite early response to the need for a state capital library referred to above. Second was the state response to local petitions to establish a tax-supported library. This involved simply the authority to use local tax-funds for this purpose and it occurred first in 1848 when Boston requested the Massachusetts legislature to grant such power to the city. Similar action took place in New Hampshire in 1849, and an even broader local enabling act for financial support was passed in Illinois in 1872. A third major development was marked by an 1890 Massachusetts act to "--promote the establishment and efficiency of free public libraries. Thus, the Bay State was not only the first to inaugurate tax-supported public library service by authorizing the establishment of the Boston Public Library, but it was also the first to organize a state agency for the extension and promotion of public libraries through the creation of a State Board of Library Commissioners"⁽³⁾

(2) Ibid., p. 106-107

(3) Ibid., p. 106

New York, New Hampshire and Wisconsin followed with the passage of similar acts within the next five years. By 1909, 34 states had created such commissions or boards. The fourth phase, of course, was the development of state-aid programs which began in Ohio in 1935. A small number of states followed suit, and the depression of the 1930's accentuated the need for state aid to assist impoverished local governments in meeting library resource needs. The most advanced state-aid program, however, did not develop until 1958 when New York established a \$10 million annual program.

Granted acceptance of the viewpoint that in most states public library services are inadequate to meet the needs of a modern society, and that the public library represents today an underdeveloped national resource, it is important to further examine these early development trends. The question is whether the nature and sequence of early development patterns carried within them weaknesses and influences which retarded growth and full acceptance of public libraries as a part of the mainstream of governmental services at all levels. Further analysis of this point will be made later in this paper. Suffice to state here that the development of local and state governmental interest in public libraries followed different time schedules, that service and proximity to service were

common ingredients in both patterns, and that the initiating impulse came from local, not state, government.

Basic Elements in State - Local Governmental Relations

"It is an established point of municipal law that local governments are creatures of the state and have no inherent powers apart from those granted by the state." (4) This doctrine finds its roots in what has become known as Dillon's Rule, referring to an 1868 Iowa decision in a case between the City of Clinton and a railroad company. This landmark decision has influenced local-state relations and the development of local governmental services for more than a century. Because of the functional characteristics of public library services and the kind of developmental trends and patterns already described, Dillon's Rule also influenced adversely the growth of public library services.

The constraints established under the Rule are quite clear. Municipal governments are received as "mere tenants at the will of the legislature". They may exercise (1) those powers granted in expressed words, (2) Those necessarily or fairly implied in, or incident to, powers expressly granted, and (3) those powers indispensable to achieving the declared objectives and basic purposes of the municipal corporation.

(4) Local Government: Reference Manual#4, The Pennsylvania Constitution Convention, 1967-68, p.5

In Pennsylvania, for example, Dillon's Rule has been precisely interpreted in a case involving the City of Philadelphia as follows.⁽⁵⁾

Local government is merely an agency instituted by the sovereign for the purpose of carrying out in detail the objects of government--essentially a revocable agency--having no vested right to any of its powers or franchises--the charter or act of creation being in no sense a contract with the State--and therefore fully subject to the control of the legislature, who may enlarge or diminish its territorial functions, may change or modify its internal arrangement, or destroy its very existence with the mere breath of arbitrary discretion.

It is true, of course, that in the decades since the turn of the century, characterized by a burgeoning population growth in urban and suburban jurisdictions, Dillon's Rule has not always been applied with the sovereign dispatch it seems to establish. Municipal jurisdictions have not been created or eliminated at the whim or will of the state legislature. Few states have adequate real power to alter out-dated municipal boundaries, and in most states it has taken a decade or

⁽⁵⁾Philadelphia v. Fox et al, Pennsylvania Supreme Court 64 Pa. 169,180.

more to consolidate school districts. Issues surrounding the growth and development of adequate, state-wide public library services, however, are of a much lower order of political visibility and volatility. It was quite easy for states to respond to petitions and requests for the requisite authority to establish local public library services. All that was required was a permissive statute which served as an adequate response to local interest groups. At the state level, a parallel need for library services for state capitol clientele groups was met, simply and independently, by establishing as an arm of one of the branches of government, a state library. Thus, any need for a state agency clearly charged with the mandate of insuring the statewide development of adequate public library services was unexpressed or delayed. The following description of Tennessee's legal base underpinning its state-aid program makes a relevant point.

An example of a state aid program that has been erected on a scanty legal foundation is that of Tennessee. Section 10-106 of the act establishing the State Library and Archives Commission consists of the following provision:

The Commission shall develop a state library program calculated to meet the needs of the state

and the requirements of its citizens for such services. It shall prepare and submit a budget consistent with its program and shall operate the state library system within the financial resources available.

Despite the brevity of this provision, the state library agency has been successful in developing a network of regional library centers. Each center is administered by a regional library board composed of two representatives from each county in the region. This board receives and expends state funds and is responsible for determining the type of program and activities to be carried on by the center, under the terms of a contract with the state library.⁽⁶⁾

The critical point here is not to justify Tennessee's state aid program, but to cite an example of a clearly expressed legislature charge "---- to develop a state library program calculated to meet the needs and requirements of its citizens for such services." The existence of the language does not insure the development of an adequate program. But, absence of such language does insure a lack of any meaningful state commitment toward an effective statewide pattern of services.

⁽⁶⁾ St. Angelo, et.al., Op.Cit., p.113

The Use of Plural Executive Agencies at the State Level

In addition to indicating the date of the enabling legislation for public library extension in each state, Table 1 also shows the type of agency created to discharge this function. This information is shown as of the date of legislative enactment, and as of 1925, 1940 and 1955. A review of the agencies designated at the time of enactment reveals that in at least 40 states a state library commission, committee or board was charged with the public library extension function. Analyses of any organization or structural changes made, as of the stated time intervals cited, indicates that, as of 1955, 30 states made some type of structural change and 18 states retained their original organizational form. It should be noted that in many instances, the change in structural form did not mark a shift in the predominant use of a plural executive agency. Name changes and shifts from Commissions to Boards, or vice versa, seem to characterize most of the changes noted. This observation is borne out to some extent by Table 2 which shows that as of 1956, a total of 37 states used relatively independent boards or commissions as their library extension agency .

Preference for use of the plural executive form continues to the present day, Table 3, compiled from data published in the State Library Policy study (St. Angelo, et. al), indicates

Table 2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Placement of Public Library Extension Agencies in the Structure of State Government: January 1956

State	Agency	Placement in the structure of government				
		Executive branch	Legislative branch	Judicial branch	Relatively independent	Diffuse
Alabama	Executive Board, Public Library Service Division, Department of Archives and History				X	
Arizona	Director, Department of Library and Archives		X			
Arkansas	Arkansas Library Commission				X	
California	State Board of Education and State Librarian					X
Colorado	State Board of Education				X	
Connecticut	State Board of Education				X	
Delaware	State Library Commission				X	
Florida	State Library Board				X	
Georgia	State Board of Education				X	
Idaho	State Library Board				X	
Illinois	Secretary of State	X				
Indiana	Library and Historical Board				X	
Iowa	Board of Trustees, State Libraries—Historical and Archives Department					X
Kansas	Kansas Traveling Libraries Commission, Traveling Library Department of the State Library				X	
Kentucky	Director, Library Extension Division	X				
Louisiana	Board of Commissioners, Louisiana State Library				X	
Maine	State Librarian	X				
Maryland	State Board of Education				X	
Massachusetts	Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners (Division of Department of Education)				X	
Michigan	State Board for Libraries				X	
Minnesota	State Board of Education				X	
Mississippi	Mississippi Library Commission				X	
Missouri	State Library Advisory Board and State Librarian					X
Montana	State Library Extension Commission				X	
Nebraska	Nebraska Public Library Commission				X	
Nevada	State Librarian	X				
New Hampshire	State Library Commission				X	
New Jersey	State Board of Education				X	
New Mexico	State Library Commission				X	
New York	Regents of the University				X	
North Carolina	Board of Trustees, North Carolina State Library (Effective July 1, 1956)				X	
North Dakota	State Library Commission (State Board of Administration)				X	
Ohio	State Library Board				X	
Oklahoma	Board of Directors, State Library			X		
Oregon	Trustees of State Library				X	
Pennsylvania	State Superintendent of Public Instruction	X				
Rhode Island	Secretary of State	X				
South Carolina	State Library Board				X	
South Dakota	State Library Commission				X	
Tennessee	State Library and Archives Commission				X	
Texas	Library and Historical Commission				X	
Utah	State Board of Education				X	
Vermont	Free Public Library Commission				X	
Virginia	The Library Board				X	
Washington	State Library Commission				X	
West Virginia	State Library Commission				X	
Wisconsin	Free Library Commission				X	
Wyoming	State Library, Archives and Historical Board				X	
Total		6	1	1	37	3

Source: The State and Publicly Supported Libraries: Structure and Control at the State Level by Fred F. Beach, et. al., Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1956, p. 19.

that as of 1971, 37 states described their state library agency as an independent board or commission. The recently completed Public Administration Service Survey (PAS) of state organization describes the data a little differently and in more detail.

"Several different patterns have been developed at the state level for organizing and administering public library services. In 25 states, responsibility is vested in either an independent committee, commission, or board. This body has the basic authority and responsibility to promote the development of public library services throughout the state. A state librarian, or an official with a similar title, who may or may not be a voting member of the governing body, is usually responsible for the day-to-day administration of the agency.

In 14 states, the department of education or its equivalent is charged with the over-all responsibility of coordinating public library services. In these states an advisory state library commission may be provided, but the over-all policy-making function remains with the department of education.

In the remaining 11 states, the responsibility for overseeing library services is variously assigned.

Table 3

State Structure and Control for Public Library Extension, by State: January 1956

Public Library Extension Administered Under Direction of—				
Controlling body created solely for public library extension	Controlling body of general state library ¹	Secretary of State	Board of Administra- tion	Controlling body of State department of education
PATTERN 1	PATTERN 2	PATTERN 3	PATTERN 4	PATTERN 5
Alabama ² Delaware Kansas ² Kentucky Massachusetts ² Mississippi Montana Nebraska South Carolina Vermont West Virginia	Arizona Arkansas Florida Idaho Indiana Iowa Louisiana Maine Michigan Missouri Nevada New Hampshire New Mexico North Carolina ⁴ Ohio Oklahoma Oregon South Dakota Tennessee Texas Virginia Washington Wisconsin Wyoming	Illinois ³ Rhode Island ²	North Dakota ³	California ³ Colorado ³ Connecticut Georgia Maryland Minnesota ³ New Jersey ³ New York ³ Pennsylvania ³ Utah
11	24	2	1	10

¹ The general State library sometimes includes archives and history.² In a department of government, but administered under direction of a controlling body relatively independent of the controlling body of the department.³ General State library administered under direction of same controlling body.⁴ In the 1955 session of the General Assembly of North Carolina provisions were made for the merger of the State library and public library extension agency in one library under a board of trustees on July 1, 1956.

Source: The State and Publicly Supported Libraries: Structure and Control at the State Level by Fred F. Beach, et. al., Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1956, p. 20.

Indiana and Vermont have library departments. In Arizona, Delaware, Florida, Illinois, and North Carolina, library service is a responsibility of another department of the state government. North Dakota assigns the function to a Board of Administration with numerous other responsibilities, while in Maine, Nevada, and Oklahoma it is directly under the governor." (7)

In connection with the PAS survey data, a question can be raised as to the advisory or administrative nature of boards and commissioners in the 14 states listed as placing responsibility for public library development in their department of education. The St. Angelo study identifies only 11 such states. However, regardless of minor differences in numbers, it is clear that the predominant pattern in state organization for public library employment involves the use of boards, commissions, or committees most of which represent plural executive agencies with administrative powers and responsibilities. Strengths and weaknesses of this kind of administrative agency will be discussed later.

(7) An Inquiry Into the Patterns Among the States for Funding Public Library Services, Public Administration Services, May 1973, p. 28.

State Structure and General Patterns for Public Library Extension

In gaining understanding and an evaluative sense of the present state role and organization for the development of public library services, it is instructive to review an early (1956) HEW report on "The State and Publicly Supported Libraries." The scope of the report covers (1) state governmental libraries, (2) public school, state college, and university libraries, and (3) local public libraries.

In the section dealing with state public library systems, the report offers the following rationale for the establishment of a public library extension agency.

"The struggle to round out State programs of public library service to meet the needs of all the people has gone on for more than a century. During this time two public agencies have had remarkable growth and development. the local public library and the public library extension agency. The local public library has passed through stages in its development similar to those of the local public school. First the libraries were under private auspices. Later on they became public institutions supported and controlled by the people. In every State the legislature eventually passed laws

permitting local communities to organize, finance, and conduct public libraries. But that was not enough. A central State agency to stimulate the development of a well-rounded State system of public libraries became indispensable. The public interest was not being served by merely permitting local libraries to operate in isolation with no central guidance or direction. State leadership was needed to close the gaps in library service and to foster the continuous improvement of public libraries everywhere in the State.

The public library system of a State is composed of local publicly supported libraries and a State agency established by the legislature to provide regulation and leadership to the local public libraries." (8)

The report describes the functions of the public library extension agency as (1) leadership, (2) regulating and (3) operational. The point is made that since maintenance of public libraries is not mandated by law, in the manner

(8) The State and Publicly Supported Libraries, U.S. Dept. of HEW, Office of Education, GPO, Washington, 1956, p. 15.

of public schools, creative leadership to develop a well-rounded program is the major responsibility of the state agency. An earlier 1905 report is cited as an indication of a major leadership purpose "to lead a community to desire a public library and then to guide that desire to practical reality and efficiency".⁽⁹⁾ Other "leadership" functions listed are planning, research, consultative and advisory services, coordination, in service training and public relations. Regulatory functions mentioned included the establishment of professional standards, certification of libraries, inspection, administration of state-aid, creation of library centers and requiring reports. Defined operational functions focussed on the provision of direct services in a gap-filling role.

Listed in the report are six specific functions with the notation that a state agency charged with public library extension may also be required to carry out one or more of the list of other responsibilities. The list includes the following functions:

- (1) General state library operation (G)
- (2) Public library extension (E)

(9) Alice S. Taylor, "The League of Library Commissions," Library Journal, Vol. 30, No. 5, May 1905, p. 275.

- (3) Law library (L)
- (4) Legislative reference (LR)
- (5) State archives (A)
- (6) State history (H)

Table 1 indicates the scope of other responsibilities of the state agency charged with public library extension. A review of the Table clearly indicates that in most states the agency in charge of public library extension is also responsible for one or more of the service providing functions listed above. Table 3 presents a summary of this data as follows: in 11 states public library extension is administered by a controlling body expressly created for that purpose; in 24 states public library extension is controlled by the governing body of the general state library and in 10 states the controlling body is the state department of education. In two other states public library is administered by the Secretary of State and in one state by the Board of Administration.

The point to be made is that in only a minority of the states is the function of public library extension the sole responsibility of a state agency expressly created for that purpose. In the vast majority of states, the business of administration and development of a statewide

program of public library services is combined with usually more than one other function which is oriented toward providing a specific service for state capitol clientele. This information is reported as of 1956; there is not comparably precise data available representing the present situation. The PAS survey does not provide adequate information on this point. General review of available information, however, leads to the conclusion that the 1956 pattern, with respect to the combination of administrative and service providing responsibilities continues to exist as the normal pattern. Phillip Monypenny, writing in 1966, lists seven functions which are discharged by the state library agency, or agencies as follows:

- (1) maintenance of a general circulating collection
- (2) operation of a general reference collection
- (3) provision of a library consultant or developmental service
- (4) management of archives and records program
- (5) provision of legislative reference and research services
- (6) maintenance of a law collection
- (7) maintenance of a historical collection. (10)

(10) The Library Function of the States, Phillip Monypenny, ALA., Chicago, 1966, p. 9.

As Monypenny points out:

-- the administrative arrangements for handling these seven state library functions follow, in general, one of two major types: (1) Integrated administrative responsibility for library functions with all, or nearly all, functions concentrated in one or two agencies; or (2) Diffused administrative responsibility for library functions with all, or nearly all functions handled by separate agencies. (11)

The data indicate that as of 1966, in some 15 states, a high degree of unification of all seven functions existed and that in a majority of other states the state agency is charged with several of the functional responsibilities listed. In discussing the state library as a multipurpose agency, Monypenny cites "one of the strong traditions about state library functions, most succinctly stated in a publication of the National Association of State Libraries, "The Role of State Libraries", is that the most effective state library is one that encompasses all library services of the state government, so integrated as to function with economy and efficiency." (12)

Unification or integration of all state library responsibilities in a single agency is not viewed negatively

(11) Ibid, p.9

(12) Ibid, p.43

by Monypenny although one section of the study comes fairly close to raising a question about the combination of administration and service functions in one agency.

In the long run, perhaps more important than the service the state libraries directly provide is their role as a center around which a program of library development can grow. The role which state governments can play in the extension of library resources is discussed in the first chapter. The only group of persons able to assume the responsibility for drawing and implementing the state plan as a whole or in its elements is the staff of whatever general library agency the state provides; in many states this means the comprehensive state library which we are here discussing.

It should be underlined that there is no inevitable connection between operating a library, of whatever range of services, and taking responsibility for improving library service on a statewide basis. However, the heads of those state libraries which do offer general services are drawn into a close relationship with library institutions all over the state, and they are made vividly aware of the character of library resources in the requests for service which are directed to them. Unlike the heads of

local library systems, their official responsibilities are not limited to any particular territory within the state. In fact, legislatures have generally given the state library a charter to concern itself with means of improving library service throughout the state.

The state libraries under review in this section have, virtually without exception, occupied themselves with this developmental responsibility, although their resources for the purpose have usually been inadequate to the job. (13)

(13) Ibid., p. 45.

Other Characteristics of State Role and Organizational Framework for Public Library Development

In addition to the basic features of state role and structure for public library development which have been described in the preceding sections, these are a number of other characteristics which can be summarized. The basic features presented thus far have been analyzed in an historical context in order to both provide a basis for evaluating the original conceptions of a state public library developmental role and to show the extent to which present patterns of state responsibilities, organization and structure have changed over the years.

Descriptions of present state administrative and organizational patterns available in secondary sources are sufficient neither in detail nor depth to permit precise or extensive evaluation. There are, however, some key features of existing state role, organizational and operational patterns which can be examined. Table 4 presents summary data which provides a basis for the following limited descriptive analysis.

1. Organizational relationships of state public agencies to departments of education. According to the St. Angelo study, as summarized in Table 4, in 12 states the state library agency is located in the State Department of Education. This study also provided evidence (1) that state

Table 4

Characteristics of State Organization and Administration of Public Libraries

State	Type of Library Administrative Organization ¹			Nature of Legislative Resp. & Authority ²		Type of Administrative Powers ³		State Aid for Libraries ⁴		Level of State Library Expenditures ⁵	
	Indep. Board or Comm.	Dept.	Other	Permissive	Mandatory	Advisory	Supervisory	Authority to Administer State Aid	Existence of State Aid Expend.	% of States' Own Funds (1972)	Amt. Per Capita (1972)
Alabama	X			X		X		X	X	5.3%	\$1.55
Alaska		X		X			X	X			
Arizona	X			X		X		X		33.5%	1.58
Arkansas	X			X		X		X	X	1.8%	5.83
California	X			X			X	X	X	NA	4.04
Colorado		X		X		X		X	X	13.0%	5.19
Connecticut	X			X		X		X			
Delaware	X			X			X	X	X	8.1%	2.35
Florida	X				X		X	X	X	40.6%	1.96
Georgia		X			X		X	X			
Hawaii	X				X		X	X			
Idaho	X				X		X	X	X	9.9%	3.42
Illinois					X		X	X	X	18.6%	4.86
Indiana	X		X	X				X			
Iowa	X			X		X		X			
Kansas	X			X		X		X			
Kentucky	X			X		X	X	X			
Louisiana	X			X		X	X	X			
Maine	X			X		X		X			
Maryland		X		X		X		X	X	46.1%	1.71
Massachusetts		X		X		X		X	X	15.1%	5.42
Michigan		X		X		X		X	X	12.7%	7.76
Minnesota		X		X		X		X			
Mississippi	X			X		X		X	X	4.1%	4.67
Missouri	X			X		X		X	X	5.8%	2.87
Montana	X			X		X		X			
Nebraska	X			X		X		X			
Nevada	X			X		X		X			
New Hampshire	X				X		X	X			
New Jersey		X			X		X	X	X	22.5%	4.82
New Mexico	X				X		X	X			
New York		X			X		X	X	X	18.6%	5.90

Table 4 (Cont'd.)

Characteristics of State Organization and Administration of Public Libraries

State	Type of Library Administrative Organization		Nature of Legislative Resp. & Authority ²		Type of Administrative Powers		State Aid for Libraries ⁴		Level of State Library Expenditures ⁵	
	Indep. Board or Comm.	Dept. Other	Permissive	Mandatory	Advisory	Supervisory	Authority to Administer State Aid	Existence of State Aid Expend. (1971)	% of States' Own Funds (1972)	Amt. Per Capita (1972)
North Carolina	X		X		X		X	X	21.4%	3.36
North Dakota	X		?		?		X			
Ohio	X		?		?		X	X	NA	2.11
Oklahoma	X			?		X	X			
Oregon	X		X		X		X			
Pennsylvania		X	X		X		X	X	58.8%	2.11
Rhode Island	X		X		X		X	X	42.4%	3.30
South Carolina	X		X		X		?	X	18.8%	1.89
South Dakota	X		NO	IN	FORMATION	AVAILABLE	X	X	22.5%	2.38
Tennessee		X	X	X	X		X			
Texas	X		X		X		X			
Utah	X		X		X		X			
Vermont	X		?		?		X			
Virginia	X		?			X	X	X	10.7%	3.26
Washington	X		X			X	?			
West Virginia	X		?			X	X			
Wisconsin		X	?			?	X			
Wyoming	X		X			X	?			
TOTAL	37	12	1				23			

1. St. Angelo, Douglas, et. al., State Library Policy: Its Legislative and Environmental Contexts, American Library Association, Chicago, 1971, pp. 84-85.

2. Data on the nature of state legislative responsibility and authority has been interpreted from Appendix I of the Public Administration Service report, An Inquiry Into the Patterns Among the States for Funding Public Library Services, Washington, D.C., 1973. In some cases, it was not possible to make a reasonably accurate interpretation. A question mark in the column indicates this difficulty.

3. Data on the either advisory or supervisory nature of state administrative powers is as indicated in Appendix I of the PAS report. In some cases, it was not possible to make a reasonably accurate interpretation. A question mark in the column indicates this difficulty.

4. Authority to administer state aid for libraries is usually indicated in Appendix I of the PAS report; information on the existence of state aid expenditures was taken from pp. 24-25 of the PAS report.

5. Rodney P. Lane, Alternatives for Financing the Public Library, Government Studies & Systems, Philadelphia, May 1974, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (in publication).

library agencies under the direction of another state agency, such as a Department of Education, generally fared better than library agencies directed by boards or commissions, and (2) that "library agencies directed by public officials received greater per capita appropriations than did agencies directed by public boards" (14).

The basic functional relationships between public education and public libraries has been commented on by a number of observers. Historically, the public demand for resources to provide information, knowledge and cultural achievement gave rise to the development of both public libraries and public education systems. Passage of compulsory education laws and the trend toward centrality in the development of public education systems resulted in a quite separate, almost monolithic, educational bureaucracy in most states. The growth of separate school libraries in most instances served to widen the gap between educational organization and the public library. As previously indicated, there has been no marked tendency toward organizational consolidation of

(14) St. Angelo, et. al., Op. cit., p. 21.

these two governmental functions. In states where the public library function was originally assigned to the State Department of Education it has so remained. Few, if any, states have reassigned the public library function and agency to the educational department.

2. Nature of state library agency authority and responsibility. The previous description and analysis of the basic elements of state-local governmental relationships and the nature of the early development of the public library provide clues as to the kind of authority structure and mandate assigned to the state library agency. The need for public libraries was perceived originally at the local community level and states were requested to grant authority, including local tax support, for establishing the institution. State responsibility for public libraries grew, in most instances, as an adjunct to a state library agency created primarily to serve state capitol clientele. State public library responsibility was viewed as an "extension" of the functions of the state library. In this context, it is significant that the term "public library extension services" is still current in the literature. Some authors have

commented on the difference between the terms "extension of the public library" and "public library development". The difference is far more than one of semantics.

The PAS survey of patterns among the states for funding public library services provides a very limited basis for analyzing the nature of the state mandate and degree of administrative clout that is legally assigned to the state library agency. Appendix I of the PAS Report⁽¹⁵⁾ provides a "Memorandum on the Legal Provisions for Public Library Services By State". Analysis of these provisions is reflected in the columns of Table 4 which show whether the powers granted under the state library laws either permit or mandate the establishment of public library services on a statewide basis. The analysis also shows whether the powers of the state library agency can be considered as advisory or supervisory. As presented in this Memorandum, the data are far from perfect for making these kinds of definitive judgments. Because of the sketchy nature of the information, some state agency characteristics may be inaccurately described. However, it is clear that the predom-

(15) Public Administration Service, Op.Cit., Appendix I

inate pattern of state legislation is permissive rather than mandatory. Few of the basic state laws underpinning the development of public libraries reflect a state legislative or administrative commitment to insure the establishment of an adequate statewide pattern of library services. While a substantial percentage of the state agencies are listed on the Table 4 as having supervisory functions and powers, nonetheless, the overall listing of state powers and supervisory functions indicates a weak administrative and organizational posture in most states.

3. State financial assistance programs and state-aid administration. A final criterion for evaluating the viability of the state role and organization for the development of public library services is an assessment of its financial aid programs. It has already been indicated that, nationally, public libraries are inadequately funded and that the institution represents an underdeveloped national resource.

As indicated in the earlier Basic Issues ⁽¹⁶⁾ paper, 35 states currently authorize some form of fiscal support for local libraries, but that not all of these states appropriate funds for such programs.

(16) Basic Issues in the Governmental Financing of the Public Library, Government Studies and Systems, Commissioned Papers Project, 1973.

The PAS study listed 23 states which had made appropriations in 1970-71 totalling \$52.5 million and ranging from \$15.5 million in New York to \$100,000 in Idaho. The type of grant program for these 23 states is also generally described.

This brief analysis of public financing patterns yields a number of conclusions: (1) The great bulk of the fiscal support for public libraries rests with local government. (2) The level of state support is significant in a few states but is nominal in most states. This indicates that, however well states have responded to the LSCA stimulus, they have not yet taken seriously the charge of insuring the development of an adequate pattern of public library services in all jurisdictions. (3) the nature and objective of operative state support programs vary widely ranging from straight per capita grants to formula based equalization grants for general operating purposes.

Table 4 lists the 23 states which actually made state-aid expenditures to public libraries. It can also be seen that in most states the administration of state aid is a responsibility of the designated state library agency, whether or not state funds have been made available for this purpose. As fur-

ther evidence of the low level of state funding, it is of interest to note that in only four of the states which operate financial assistance programs does the percentage of funds from the state's own sources exceed a 40 percent level. As indicated by the last column of Table 4 the per capita amount of state and local expenditures ranges from \$1.55 in Alabama to \$7.76 in Massachusetts.

III. State Performance and Prospective Capabilities for the Development of State-wide Public Library Services

The preceding sections of this paper have presented (1) a broad-brush overview of the present status of public library services and, against that overview, (2) a descriptive analysis of selected key factors and characteristics relevant to current state role, and the structural and organizational framework for public library development. It is the intent in this section to come to terms with the central objective of this paper which is to assess the performance and future capability of the state in the development of public library services.

In making a general assessment of where the states are today in this field, it is useful to refer to Carleton Joeckel's impressionistic general conclusion from his 1935 study. Some selected excerpts follow.

If the impression conveyed by the preceding chapters is one of confusion and of lack of sharply defined and systematic direction, it is not surprising. In a program which has been essentially opportunist in nature, there is no common thread of similarity in form on which to draw the various parts together. We speak loosely of the public library system of the country, but to use the word "system" in this connection is decidedly

F
misleading. Only in a few states is library service universal in extent, and in those it is scarcely systematic. In no state is it equal, and little serious attempt at equalization has been made. Substantial uniformity in form has been achieved in a few states, but throughout the country as a whole there is the greatest possible variation both in details and in underlying principles.

SR
The libraries of the corporation and association group are still numerous but have passed the zenith of their importance as a class. Some of them have earned the right to survive, if they really desire to retain their present forms. Others will continue to exist through the sheer inertia of tradition and custom. As a group, future years will undoubtedly show a slow but steady decrease in their number and importance.

The municipal public library has been generally accepted as the standard type. In their connection with municipal units of all kinds, we have seen that public libraries are divided into two unequal groups. In the larger of these, the library is administered by a separate board; in the smaller, it is a city department under a single executive.

In short, the forces of local effort and initiative, by which the public libraries of the nation have been largely built up, have very nearly reached the limit of their power to extend library service. Further progress of the library movement by the individualistic method, either quantitatively over larger areas of territory or, to a lesser extent, qualitatively in establishing more uniform and higher standards of service in existing libraries, is bound to be increasingly slow and difficult.

Meanwhile, the forces supporting a collectivist philosophy for libraries in general, and larger units in particular, are organizing and gathering strength at an accelerating pace. They are faced with many practical difficulties, both in their future relations to government and in their relations to the library as an institution. (1)

(1)

Carleton Bruns Joeckel, The Government of the American Public Library, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill., 1935, pp. 341-343.

To be sure, many changes have occurred in the public library field since Joeckel wrote the above summary almost 40 years ago. But notwithstanding the changes, including almost two decades of Federal involvement under LSA and LSCA, the observations made earlier in this paper that the public library today represents an underdeveloped national resource, not yet in the mainstream of government or public education, closely parallel Joeckel's earlier assessment.

There is much closer alignment between another of Joeckel's perceptive observations concerning the role of the state and present day considerations as viewed in this paper. The 1935 study makes the following point.

In the majority of states, however, it seems unavoidable that public libraries must move in the direction of a more positive and effective interest of the state in library organization and support. Unless this state interest becomes a reality, there is, in a large portion of the country, little hope for the development of public libraries on a really complete and systematic basis.

It is most unlikely that the interest of the state will extend to actual management of the library system as a whole, except possibly in very small states.

Rather than attempt direct administration, the activities of the state should be confined to the following fields: (1) necessary legislation, (2) maintenance of standards, (3) grants-in-aid of sufficient size to permit a substantial amount of equalization of library service throughout the state. (2)

It is interesting and perhaps significant that Joeckel's use of the word "unavoidable," his earlier reference to a "collectivist philosophy," and his proscription, above, that states should not attempt "actual management of the library system" seem to suggest the state and governmental role should be activated only as last resort measures. Whatever the causes of this kind of hesitancy and reservation, the extent to which it exists can thwart, delay, and distort a proper and strategic development of the governmental role and responsibility.

Philosophic differences aside, Joeckel's basic point can be reemphasized today--and without constricting reservations. It seems apparent that development of an adequate pattern of public library services available to all citizens depends primarily upon the activation and further implementation of a clearly defined state role and responsibility. The nature of library

(2)

Ibid. pp. 353-354.

services, the distribution of their real and potential benefits, the present governmental and inter-governmental administrative and fiscal support patterns all can be cited as bases for this statement.

Overall Assessment of State Performance

In view of this kind of role challenge, how then have the states performed, and what is their prospective capability for meeting this kind of challenge in the future. It is the basic conclusion of this paper that states in most instances have not performed adequately, or even well, in their efforts to sustain and build a pattern of public library services to meet the needs of a modern society. The failure, however, cannot be charged solely, or even in major part, to the recalcitrance or intransigence of state government. The library community properly must assume some of the burden of failure. Part can be attributed to a Balkanized pattern of local government whose political boundaries make the establishment of effective library service districts so difficult; and part can be assigned to the Federal level.

The extent to which the public library community has seen itself as a wholly separate and select private-public institution, the extent to which it has rested on its historic traditions and maintained a passive role in

a changing, turbulent society, and the extent to which it has resisted lateral and vertical functional linkages with other libraries and with the appropriate state agencies can be viewed as contributing to the slow emergence of a state agency with overall responsibility. At the outset of this paper it was stated that public libraries are, essentially, local institutions and that they should remain so. However, localism, in this instance, should not be translated as complete autonomy. Nor should the unique developmental history and tradition of the public library in this country be used either as a refuge from modern society or as a basis for clothing the institution in a kind of transcendent garb. As stated in the earlier Basic Issues paper, "Society has a history of responding with only an elusive and partial commitment to those social institutions which aspire to transcendent qualities." (3) John Bebout describes the point harshly, but clearly:

Public libraries that are worth their salt are no longer the somewhat cloistered institutions of local cultural benevolence that many of them once were...As institutions, however, they are caught in a vast web of governmental organizations and practices - national, state, local - that has come to be called partnership federalism. The

(3)

R. P. Lane, Basic Issues in the Governmental Financing of Public Library Services, Commissioned Papers Project, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1973, p. 54.

nation is just beginning to become aware of the complex system of intergovernmental relationships that has evolved out of the relatively simple concept of federalism embodied in the Constitution of 1787. Libraries, quantitatively miniscule elements in the system, have hardly sensed the implication of this evolution for either their institutional integrity or their function in society. (4)

There are, of course, notable exceptions to the general conclusion that state performance in the development of public libraries has been limited and inadequate. New York State, for example, has developed a strong state role and organizational framework which has been responsible for significant public library expansion and the development of effective public library systems in that state. The system structure in that state has made it the right of nearly every person, to tap, through his own local library outlet, the entire chain of library resources which are linked together by system organization. Pennsylvania, in 1967, took a hard look at its progress since the passage of its 1961 comprehensive Library Code. The 1967 evaluation was a prod toward further state agency development and some responses have been made. A new comprehensive Master plan has been prepared and calls for significant expansion and coordination

(4)

John E. Bebout "Partnership Federalism," in The Metropolitan Library, edited by Ralph Conant and Kathleen Molz, M.I.T Press, 1972, p. 79.

of all library services. Other examples could be cited, but the purpose here is not to return a judiciously balanced individual state library performance. Notwithstanding the bright spots and the success stories the general charge that states have not performed adequately the public library development role remains valid.

Underlying Causes and Characteristics of a Weak State Role
in Public Library Development

Given some degree of agreement with respect to the foregoing conclusion that state performance has been deficient, it is important to define and further analyze some of the possible root causes. The intent is not only to validate the overall appraisal, but, more importantly, to thereby suggest guidelines and general criteria through which state performance might be upgraded.

Legal base, governmental role and performance characteristics in a democracy are, in a sense, dependent variables conditioned and made operative or inoperative by the organized efforts of interested constituencies. Alex Ladenson's quote of Roscoe Pounds profound statement about legislation makes somewhat the same point.

Any general discussion of the subject of legislation may be prefaced by the observation that legislation does not originate in a vacuum. Most legislation, if not all, is deeply rooted in the social, economic and political soil of society, for law and legislation are merely tools to produce social results. Roscoe Pound, former dean of the Harvard Law School, stated this idea clearly when he wrote that legislation is asked to put what has already been worked out in experience into the form of legal precepts. It follows

from this generalization that library legislation is not something that is static. It is in a constant state of change and evolution and hardly a legislative session either at the state or federal level is permitted to pass without some library law being enacted. The periods of greatest productivity in library legislation are those when new ideas are injected into the social crucible for the production of libraries. (5)

It follows then that definition of State role and performance criteria has been and will continue to be subject to the expressed desires of the public library community and related interested support group. Of course, all governmental functions and service areas must compete for the tax dollar, but it is vital to have well-established, generally accepted goals in order to compete successfully. In most states, for example, it required at least a decade or more of public and civic endeavor to formulate, legislate and implement a state government role and responsibility in the mental health field. The same is true of the public welfare and public assistance fields. Currently, there is a broad-based citizens movement to up-grade the

(5) Alex Ladenson, "Library Legislation: Some General Considerations." Library Trends, October, 1970, p. 175.

performance of state and local government in the criminal justice area. It is interesting to note too, that in these three governmental areas, efforts to establish or improve state government performance had to battle fear, stigma, or apathy, and sometimes all three. It can be argued successfully that emergence of the state role for public library development did not encounter this kind or degree of negative resistance. There were, nonetheless, other factors and considerations which had a delimiting or constricting effect.

The basic cause of the present weak state role and administrative posture for public library development is the ambivalence and lack of clarity within the library community about the optimum form and nature of the states' proper authority and function in the field. The essential relationships between the functional services provided by public libraries and the administrative mechanisms and governmental authority structures required to make the services available have not been sufficiently established. This adds up to the need for clear perception and hard-headed, realistic thinking in governmental administrative terms if we are to achieve the goal of improved services for all citizens. Obviously, the research on which this paper is based is by no means exhaustive, but the literature

examined tends to be overly introspective and seems to lack adequate attention to these kinds of external, but vital, considerations.

The ambivalence concerning state role definition, noted above, goes back as far as the 1935 Joeckel study. In the earlier references, Joeckel stated that "the number of independent local library units is already far too great," but then he calls, haltingly, for a state "interest" to be expressed in quite limited non-management terms. A 1971 article entitled "Library Leadership and the State Library Agency" begins with the following strong disclaimer about the state agency role.

In spite of what appears to be a beginning awareness of the potential usefulness of state library agencies, any implication that the business of leadership in library matters ought to be handed over, lock, stock, and barrel to some presumptuous and self-designated government agency calls for an early and emphatic disclaimer. Therefore, let it hereby be emphatically disclaimed that a case is about to be made that any single element of the profession should attempt to don the whole splendid array of leadership hats now worn by the many individual librarians and nonlibrarians friendly to the library cause,

the professional library associations, library schools, trustee groups, units of government, and others who have long shared the library leadership role. (6)

Yet, the author of the above article concludes with a recommendation for a stronger state governmental role.

Perhaps the most pronounced indication of ambivalence is the degree of confusion and lack of clarity surrounding the definition of what the state library agency should be. Inspection of the 1969 "Standards for Library Functions at the State Level" provides evidence of this point. The chapter on organization of state library services begins with the following general section and standards which provide not much in the way of definitive guidelines and criteria.

There is no one standard structure or prototype for state library service. State governments have developed in different ways, at different times, and to different extents. Historical growth has played a part in state library organization, as have principles of administration applied to the structure of state government.

(6) "Library Leadership and the State Library Agency," S. Gilbert Prentiss, American Libraries, Feb. 1970, p. 186.

A state library agency carries the major responsibility for library development and library coordination. It is that unit in state government charged by law with providing the state's library program, with coordinating library planning for total library service, and, in many cases, serving state government.

It receives and disburses state and federal funds for library services according to state and federal authorizations and appropriations. It is responsible for the statewide library program: for research, planning, leading, and coordinating; for seeing that services improve and development takes place within the state; for providing direct services where appropriate; and for acting on behalf of the state in cooperative programs with agencies outside the state.

The administrative structure for library service need not be the same from state to state, even as it need not be the same among private enterprises. There are, however, principles of organization which apply generally, and which must be followed if the full range of state

library activities is to be maintained at a sound level and at reasonable cost. These principles form the basis of the standards for state library organization. (Standards 52-55 follow).

52. The agency or agencies providing state library services should rest upon clear statutory provisions which define the functions to be performed, provide authority for these activities, and ensure the legal basis for a flexible program to meet the needs of the state.

53. The state library or state library agencies should be so placed in the structure of government that they have the authority and status to discharge their responsibilities.

54. Every state should make administrative provision for the following major areas of state library service: providing, correlating, and servicing print and nonprint resources; giving direct service to state government; planning and coordinating total library service; and supervising state and federally funded programs.

Qualified personnel must be assigned to each area.

55. The several state library agencies dealing with the broad areas of state responsibility should be

unified as one department or division of government to the extent possible and advisable under state law, policy, and tradition.(7)

Walter Brahm has pointed out that the National Association of State Libraries in 1956 held that "-- the state library is the focal point of state-wide library services (and that it includes) the generally recognized components of an integrated state library agency as: general library service, archives, extension, government publications, law, legislative reference, state history, and special library services."(8) He then points out that while the 1969 "Standards" range from "-- what a state library is, through where it should be, to how it should operate, the functions basically were those enumerated by the National Association of State Libraries."(9)

The point to be made here is that the list of state library functions which the "Standards" document accepts represents a potpourri of library services related most directly to the internal business of running a state

(7) Standards for Library Functions at the State Level, A.L.A., Chicago, 1970, pp. 21-24.

(8) Walter Brahm, Legislation Relating to State Library Agencies, Library Trends, October 1970, p. 260-261.

(9) Ibid. p.26.

government. Only the word "extension" comes close to suggesting an administrative and supervisory role directing a program of public library development at the local governmental level. In any professional field, standards are invariably a compromise between what is and what ought to be. The observation here is that the 1969 "Standards" do not raise this important, if not vital, question and they do not provide any definitive guidelines for future state library agency development. Thus, the ambivalence about role and function is justified and perpetuated.

There are, in the literature of the field, some additional manifestations or products of the ambivalence about state role and functions of the state library agency. This set of characteristics can best be described by reference to the use in the literature of the terms "leadership," "coordination," "library systems" and "network." The Prentiss article, previously referred to, discusses leadership in relation to library systems and networks.

Government serves many purposes, but none more important than leadership; it is in the area of leadership that government's most disastrous and consistent failures have occurred. At the state level, the best library agency will

be one that is designed to protect and nurture the leadership function beyond all others. It should be a place where both the nitty gritty and the idealistic aspects of leadership are given full credence; where the library enterprise is related to the real needs of people and society, and creative solutions are arrived at by genuinely cooperative efforts; where leadership breeds leadership at other levels and from other sources; and where judgments are consistently made in terms of human values.

Although they have received little attention for that reason, many library systems and networks, devised to formalize interrelationships among libraries without seriously interfering with the autonomy of the individual participating libraries, are markedly innovative in structure and in some cases even may be unique in governmental organization. (10)

It is, of course, a function of government to provide leadership, but in a climate of ambivalence about the scope, nature and authority of the state library agency, and where

(10) S. Gilbert Prentiss, op-cit, p. 191.

the character of basic state statutes concerning public library development is permissive rather than mandatory, then leadership becomes merely a matter of highly personified artful persuasion. The administrative life and impact of the state agency head responsible for public library development becomes too much a matter of negotiation between "leader" and "followers." Under such conditions, the negotiations may well produce policies and plans with a high level of general acceptability within the library community, but a low level of progressive development and forward movement. Much the same limitation applies to the term "coordination." Some observers of the public administration field quote the old rule that coordination subsumes subordination. Others point out that without some degree of subordination, there can be no effective coordination. Thus, the task of coordinating the policies and operational patterns of autonomous or semi-autonomous public libraries becomes difficult indeed.

Similar difficulties exist in the use and application of the terms "systems" and "networks." Charles and Anne Nelson have stated, "It has been said before but will bear repetition: the future of libraries lies in the systems approach. The enthusiasm for systems, however, must be translated into decisions on policy, financing, organiza-

tion, and a multitude of other matters before anything meaningful can be developed." (11) The point is well made and can be emphasized in the context of a discussion of state role. Approaches and devices to link the service and operational functions of public libraries to exploit and enlarge their potential utilization are of course important. But, the systems approach, the planning of networks of library services, and the use of advanced media technology cannot fill the need for role definition, legal mandate, and a well-defined organizational framework.

(11) Charles and Anne Nelson, "Systems and Networks: The State Library Role " American Libraries.

Summary of Key Factors Impacting on State Role Development

The preceding discussion of underlying causes provides the basis for a brief summary of specific factors which have constrained the development of a strong state role and expanded public library services.

1. State Legislative Base for Library Services. There is a need for more definitive standards and a model state act which specify that states should mandate the progressive development of adequate public library services available to all citizens. Such standards and model act should clearly assign basic responsibility for the development of public library services to an administrative agency in the executive branch of state government. The legislative base should also clearly require, and provide the necessary administrative machinery for, coordination of all library resources in the state with the goal of insuring maximum effective utilization of all library resources by all citizens. The legislation should be strategically designed to take account of the many and varied library interests in each state, but it should clearly commit the state and its chief executive officer to the progressive development of adequate public library services.

2. Use of State Library Boards and Commissions. State library commissions, described in this paper as plural executive bodies, have performed yeoman's service in the development of public libraries in this country. They have performed well as both administrative and advisory bodies. At the state level, under the kind of legislative base described above, a library board or commission charged with administrative powers and duties is an unwieldy organizational form at best. Considering the basic function of public libraries, their developmental status, and the governmental and intergovernmental relations involved in achieving expanded services, the preferred organizational form is to assign full administrative responsibility to a single executive agency, under the governor. The basic state library law should require a strong advisory board with well-defined review, oversight and reporting, but not administrative, responsibilities.

3. Placement of the State Library Agency. Structural placement of the kind of agency described above may well vary from state to state. A strong legislative base mandating the development of public library services provides more latitude in the structural placement of the agency. Relationships between modern public library services and a broadly

conceived program of public education are obvious. Moreover, the arguments, advanced by St. Angelo, et. al., that public libraries fare better in a department of education setting are persuasive. With the proviso that it is probably not advisable to place the public library function in a separate or independent state department, the final decision on placement and changes in placement should be a matter of state discretion.

4. Relationships between service providing and administrative library functions. The progressive development of adequate public library services for all citizens should not be ancillary to a state library or other agency whose primary mission is to provide library services to state capitol clientele. Archival, legislative references and law libraries, and similar functions are essentially internal services for state government operations. There is no clear need indicating that they should be a responsibility of the state library agency; they might well be assigned for administrative direction to a department of administration. The task of state public library development, as viewed here, is essentially a high level administrative task involving planning, budgeting, state-aid administration, standards implementation, and a full set of general supervisory and

administrative relationships with other governmental agencies and local public libraries.

5. Considerations for Funding the Public Library. An earlier report by Government Studies and Systems, now in publication, for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) recommends a balanced intergovernmental financing pattern for public libraries. Specifically the proportions recommended are: 20 percent federal funds; 50 percent state funds and 30 percent local funds. This distributional pattern places a far greater financial responsibility on states than most states here as yet assumed. Implementation of this pattern calls for a thorough-going review of all state fiscal provisions and existing formulas used in present state-local library financing systems. Financing bases and concerns growing out of the Serrano-Priest issue and related concerns in public education finance should be viewed as applicable in funding the local public library. Local tax rate ceilings and limitations for funding the public library should be eliminated. Special consideration should be given to any new federal provisions and regulations for funding the public library toward the goal of establishing a compatible, coordinated intergovernmental funding system.

Incentives for encouraging, or requiring, adequate local government funding of the public library should be included.